

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-41 are pending. Claims 1-36 and 38-41 stand rejected. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claim 37 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. In view of the amendments and remarks set forth below, however, applicants respectfully submit that rewriting claim 37 is unnecessary. In this amendment claims 1, 20, 28 and 30 are amended and claims 31-32 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Accordingly, previously rejected claims 1-36 and 38-41 are presented for reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview of May 27, 2010. During the interview, the amendments to the claims were discussed. The Examiner confirmed that the filing of the amendments with an RCE would not result in the issuance of a Final Office Action as a response to the RCE.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action sets forth at page 2 "Claims 1, 8, 9, 10 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnott (U.S. Patent 3,581,137)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited in claim 1, includes features not disclosed or suggested by Arnott, namely:

... an optic device disposed between the source of light and the down conversion material, having at least one transparent side wall absent the down conversion material, configured to receive the backward transmitted light and transfer the backward transmitted light outside of the optic device through the at least one transparent side wall. (Emphasis Added)

Arnott is relied upon as disclosing "an optic device, having at least one transparent sidewall ... configured to receive the backward transmitted light and transfer the backward transmitted light outside of the optic device through the at least one transparent side wall." Arnott fails to disclose or suggest, however, that i) the optic device is disposed between the source of light and the down conversion material or ii) the at least one transparent side wall is

absent to down conversion material. Rather, Arnott requires that the down conversion material be placed on the at least one transparent side wall in order to satisfy its intended purpose. In contrast, applicants' invention, as recited in claim 1, requires that i) the optic device is disposed between the source of light and the down conversion material and ii) the at least one transparent side wall is absent the down conversion material.

Because Arnott fails to disclose each and every feature of applicants' claim, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Arnott be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Although not identical, claim 28 includes features similar to those of claim 1 and, thus, is likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8-10 depend upon allowable claim 1 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The Office Action sets forth at page 3 "Claims 1-7, 10-13, 28-30 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iwasa et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0047516 A1)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Iwasa is relied upon as disclosing "an optic device, having at least one transparent side wall (18), configured to receive the backward transmitted light and transfer the backward transmitted light outside of the optic device through the at least one transparent side wall." Iwasa fails to disclose or suggest, however, that i) the optic device is disposed between the source of light and the down conversion material and ii) the at least one transparent side wall is absent to down conversion material.

In contrast, applicants' invention requires that i) the optic device is disposed between the source of light and the down conversion material and ii) the at least one transparent side wall is absent to down conversion material. Accordingly, because Iwasa fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Iwasa should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Although not identical, claims 28 and 30 include features similar to that of claim 1 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 10-13, 29 and 39 depend upon one of allowable claims 1 or 28 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28.

The Office Action sets forth at page 6 "Claims 20, 22, 25, 33, 35, 36, 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tymianski (U.S. Patent 6,385,855)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited in claim 20, includes features not disclosed or suggested by Arnott, namely:

. . . a light transmissive cylindrical optic comprising at least two separate segments, each of the separate segments having a planar surface adjacent each other. (Emphasis Added)

Tymianski is relied upon as disclosing "a down conversion material, disposed along a central longitudinal axis within the cylindrical optic ... for at least one of transmitting or reflecting light transmitted by the light radiation source." Tymianski fails to disclose or suggest, however, a light transmissive cylindrical optic comprising at least two separate segments with each of the separate segments having a planar surface adjacent each other. Rather, Tymianski discloses a light source coupled to a core (relied upon as applicants' light transmissive cylindrical optic) surrounded by a cladding. There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Tymianski that the core comprises at least two segments with each of the separate segments having a planar surface adjacent each other.

Accordingly, because Tymianski fails to disclose each and every feature of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 as being anticipated by Tymianski be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 22, 25, 33, 35, 36, 38 and 41 depend upon allowable claim 20 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20.

The Office Action sets forth at page 7 "Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas (U.S. Patent 5,097,175)." Although applicants do not agree with the rejection, in order to expedite prosecution applicants' herein cancel claims 31-32 without prejudice or disclaimer, thus obviating the rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action sets forth at page 8 "Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasa et al. in view of Tarsa (U.S. Patent 6,350,041)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Tarsa is relied upon as disclosing "a collecting device for collecting backward transmitted light which has been transferred out of the optic device." Tarsa fails to make up for the deficiencies, however, of Iwasa discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, because claims 14-16 depend upon allowable claim 1 applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 14-16 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Office Action sets forth at page 10 "Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasa et al. in view of Broer (U.S. Patent 6,210,012)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Broer is relied upon as "[disclosing] the geometric shape of the optic device including a box-shaped apparatus..." Broer fails to make up for the deficiencies, however, of Iwasa discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Because claim 17 depends upon allowable claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The Office Action sets forth at page 10 "Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasa et al. in view of Tarsa and Kano et al. (U.S. Patent 3,875,456)." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Kano is relied upon as "[disclosing] a light diffuser...deposited on top of at least a portion of the reflector." Kano fails to make up for the deficiencies, however, of Iwasa and Tarsa discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 18-19 depend upon allowable claim 1. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect claim 1.

The Office Action sets forth at page 11 "Claims 21, 23, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tymianski in view of Iwasa et al." Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 21, 23, 26 and 27 depend upon allowable claim 20. The deficiencies of Tymianski were discussed above with respect to claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that Iwasa fails to make up for those deficiencies. Specifically, Iwasa fails to disclose or suggest a light transmissive cylindrical optic comprising at least two separate segments each of the separate segments having a planar surface adjacent each other. Accordingly, the combination of Tymianski and Iwasa are likewise deficient. Accordingly, because claims 21, 23, 26 and 27 depend upon allowable claim 20, these claims are likewise allowable over the cited prior art.

The Office Action sets forth at page 12 "Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tymianski." Claim 34 depends upon allowable claim 20. The deficiencies of Tymianski with respect to claim 20 were discussed above. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that claim 34 is allowable at least in view of its dependence on allowable claim 20.


Appln. No.: 10/583,105
Amendment Dated June 3, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action of April 12, 2010

RPI-134US

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

JLE/kpc

Dated: June 3, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.